

NO SKEW BRANES ON NON-DEGENERATE HYPERQUADRICS

JI-PING SHA AND BRUCE SOLOMON

ABSTRACT. We show that non-degenerate hyperquadrics in $\mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ admit no skew branes. Stated more traditionally, a compact codimension-one immersed submanifold of a non-degenerate hyperquadric of euclidean space must have parallel tangent spaces at two distinct points. Similar results have been proven by others, but (except for ellipsoids in $\mathbf{R}^3$) always under C^2 smoothness and genericity assumptions. We use neither assumption here.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

A *non-degenerate hyperquadric* in $\mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ is a level set of a non-degenerate real quadratic form on $\mathbf{R}^{n+2}$. We show here that any C^1 immersion from a compact smooth manifold M^n into $\mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ with image on such a hyperquadric must have a *pair of parallel tangent planes*. Our main result expresses this precisely:

Theorem 1.1. *Let M denote a compact smooth n -manifold. If a C^1 immersion $F : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ maps M into a non-degenerate hyperquadric, then there are distinct points $p, q \in M$ such that $dF(T_p M) = dF(T_q M)$.*

In short, the unoriented gauss map on a compact immersed n -dimensional submanifold of a non-degenerate hyperquadric in $\mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ cannot be injective. [GS] and [T] call a compact immersed codimension two submanifold of $\mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ with injective unoriented gauss map a *skew brane*. From that viewpoint, Theorem 1.1 says:

No skew brane in $\mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ lies on a non-degenerate hyperquadric.

Compare this fact with the main result of [GS]: Namely that in $\mathbf{R}^3$, 1-dimensional skew branes—*skew loops*—can be immersed on any closed C^2 surface which is *not* quadric. It seems likely that skew branes are common in higher odd dimensions too.

Other authors have obtained weaker versions of Theorem 1.1. In 1971, generalizing an earlier curve-theoretic result of B. Segre [Se], J.H. White ruled out “generic” C^2 skew branes on ellipsoids [W]. In 2002, S. Tabachnikov extended White’s result to all other non-degenerate hyperquadrics under the same genericity and smoothness

Date: First draft November 12, 2004. Last Typeset February 1, 2008.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C40, 53C42; Secondary 57R42, 57R70.

Key words and phrases. skewbrane, skewloop, hyperquadric.

hypotheses [T]. More recently, M. Ghomi [G] was able to remove White's C^2 and genericity assumptions, but only for the case of 1-dimensional skew branes—*skew loops*—on ellipsoids in $\mathbf{R}^3$.

Our main contribution here lies with Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, which allow us to remove the genericity and C^2 assumptions quite generally. We thank our colleague Paul Kirk for asking a question which suggested the latter Lemma. That result helps us improve an earlier argument by the second author, which proved Theorem 1.1 for all non-degenerate hyperquadrics except ellipsoids.

We now discuss some preparatory ideas and notation.

Given a non-degenerate quadric hypersurface $\mathcal{Q}$ in $\mathbf{R}^{n+2}$, one can always find a real symmetric non-singular matrix Q and a number c such that

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{n+2} : x \cdot Q x = c\} .$$

If $c \neq 0$, $\mathcal{Q}$ forms a smooth hypersurface in $\mathbf{R}^{n+2}$. If $c = 0$, $\mathcal{Q}$ forms a cone over a smooth product of ellipsoids, and has an isolated singular point at the origin. To distinguish the two cases, we shall respectively say that $\mathcal{Q}$ is *smooth* or *conical*.

Fixing $\mathcal{Q}$ and Q as above, let M be a compact smooth n -manifold, and $F : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ a C^1 immersion whose image lies on $\mathcal{Q}$. We consider the energy function $\mathcal{E}_F : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{E}_F(p, q) := (F(p) - F(q)) \cdot Q (F(p) - F(q)) .$$

Following [W] and [T], we can relate the existence of parallel tangent planes for F to that of certain critical points for $\mathcal{E}_F$:

Observation 1.2. *If $d\mathcal{E}_F$ vanishes at $(p, q) \in M \times M$, then either F has parallel tangent planes at p and q , or else $F(p) = \lambda F(q)$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$, with $\lambda = \pm 1$ if $\mathcal{Q}$ is smooth.*

Proof. Differentiating the identity $F \cdot Q F \equiv c$, one sees immediately that $dF(T_p M)$ is perpendicular to $Q F(p)$ and $dF(T_q M)$ is perpendicular to $Q F(q)$.

At the same time, by differentiating $\mathcal{E}_F$, we similarly find that both $dF(T_p M)$ and $dF(T_q M)$ are perpendicular to $Q F(p) - Q F(q)$ whenever $d\mathcal{E}_F$ vanishes at (p, q) . Together, these facts make both $dF(T_p M)$ and $dF(T_q M)$ perpendicular to both $Q F(p)$ and $Q F(q)$ at any critical point of $\mathcal{E}_F$.

Since $dF(T_p M)$ and $dF(T_q M)$ both have codimension two in $\mathbf{R}^{n+2}$, we now get $dF(T_p M) = dF(T_q M)$, i.e., a pair of parallel tangent planes, as long as $Q F(p)$ and $Q F(q)$ are linearly independent.

If, on the other hand, they are linearly dependent, then $Q F(p) = \lambda Q F(q)$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$. Since Q is non-singular, this means $F(p) = \lambda F(q)$ as well. And when $\mathcal{Q}$

is smooth, we can further deduce that $\lambda = \pm 1$ by dotting the preceding identities with each other and using $F(p) \cdot Q F(p) = F(q) \cdot Q F(q) = c \neq 0$. $\square$

When we prove our main result in §2 below, the preceding Observation will, virtually by itself, give the desired conclusion when $\mathcal{Q}$ is conical. The smooth case, however, requires the additional ideas we develop next.

Define three subsets of the product $M \times M$, two of which depend on the immersion $F : M \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &:= \{(p, p) : p \in M\} \quad (\text{diagonal of } M \times M), \\ D_F &:= \{(p, q) : p \neq q, F(p) = F(q)\} \quad (\text{double-point locus}), \\ A_F &:= \{(p, q) : F(p) = -F(q)\} \quad (\text{antipodal locus}) \end{aligned}$$

The diagonal Δ is clearly a compact, embedded submanifold of $M \times M$, and is diffeomorphic to M .

Observation 1.3. *When $\mathcal{Q}$ is smooth, D_F and A_F are disjoint compact subsets of $(M \times M) \setminus \Delta$.*

Proof. We have $0 \notin F(M)$ because $\mathcal{Q}$ is smooth, and hence $D_F \cap A_F = \emptyset$. Since $M \times M$ is compact, the Observation follows easily if both D_F and A_F are closed in $M \times M$. That A_F is closed is obvious. To see that D_F is also closed, note that $D_F \cup \Delta$ is closed; it then suffices to show Δ is open in $D_F \cup \Delta$, which holds because F is an immersion. Indeed, each point $p \in M$ has an open neighborhood U_p on which F is injective, and hence $D_F \cap (U_p \times U_p) = \emptyset$. $\square$

Unlike the diagonal Δ , the double-point and antipodal loci D_F and A_F are not, in general, submanifolds of $M \times M$. We therefore make the following definition:

Definition 1.4. We call a C^1 immersion $F : M \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ *DA-regular* if D_F and A_F are both embedded $(n - 1)$ -dimensional C^1 submanifolds of $M \times M$.

2. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM.

We precede our proof of Theorem 1.1 with two Lemmas. The first was perhaps overlooked in [W] and [T]. It will free us from the need to *assume* DA-regularity of F in Theorem 1.1. The second is a C^1 -Morse-theoretic statement that lets us dispense with the C^2 assumption used by earlier authors.

Lemma 2.1. *When $\mathcal{Q}$ is smooth, a C^1 immersion $F : M \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ is either DA-regular, or else has a pair of parallel tangent planes.*

Proof. We will use the following general fact: Suppose T_1 and T_2 are subspaces of a vector space T . Then for any $(X, Y) \in T_1 \times T_2$, we have

$$(1) \quad (X, Y) = \frac{1}{2} (X + Y, X + Y) + \frac{1}{2} (X - Y, Y - X) .$$

This corresponds to the direct sum decomposition $T \times T = T_\Delta \oplus T_\Delta^\perp$, where $T_\Delta := \{(Z, Z) : Z \in T\}$, and $T_\Delta^\perp := \{(Z, -Z) : Z \in T\}$. Noticing that the map $Z \mapsto (Z, -Z)$ gives an isomorphism $T \approx T_\Delta^\perp$, we see that $\{(X - Y, Y - X) : X \in T_1, Y \in T_2\} = T_\Delta^\perp$ iff $T_1 + T_2 = T$, i.e. T_1 and T_2 are transverse in T . It then follows easily from (1) that $T_1 \times T_2$ is transverse to T_Δ in $T \times T$ iff T_1 and T_2 are transverse in T .

To exploit this fact, consider the C^1 map

$$\widehat{F} : (M \times M) \setminus \Delta \rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{Q}, \quad \widehat{F}(p, q) := (F(p), F(q)) .$$

Suppose that whenever $(p, q) \in D_F$, $dF(T_p M) \neq dF(T_q M)$. As unequal hyperplanes, these two subspaces are transverse in $T_{F(p)} \mathcal{Q}$. Taking $T_1 = dF(T_p M)$, $T_2 = dF(T_q M)$ and $T = T_{F(p)} \mathcal{Q} = T_{F(q)} \mathcal{Q}$ for each $(p, q) \in D_F$ now yields, via the general fact above, transversality of $\widehat{F}$ with respect to the diagonal $\mathcal{Q}_\Delta := \{(x, x) : x \in \mathcal{Q}\}$. This makes $D_F = \widehat{F}^{-1}(\mathcal{Q}_\Delta)$ an embedded submanifold of $M \times M$ with codimension $\dim M + \dim M - \dim \mathcal{Q} = 2n - (n + 1) = n - 1$, as desired ([H, Theorem 1.3.3]).

To prove the same for A_F , note that $d(-F)(T_p M) = dF(T_p M)$ for all $p \in M$, and run the same argument with $\widehat{F}$ replaced by the map $(p, q) \mapsto (F(p), -F(q))$. $\square$

Lemma 2.2. *Let W be a connected compact C^∞ manifold, and let $f : W \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a C^1 function. Suppose $\Lambda_0 := f^{-1}(0)$ and $\Lambda_1 := f^{-1}(1)$ are both non-empty C^1 -embedded submanifolds of W . If f has no critical point on $W \setminus (\Lambda_0 \cup \Lambda_1)$, then Λ_1 is a deformation retract of $W \setminus \Lambda_0$.*

Proof. Fix a smooth riemannian metric on W . When an embedded submanifold $\Lambda \subset W$ is merely C^1 , the “nearest-point retraction” may not be well-defined on any neighborhood of Λ . Still, by using a C^1 approximation of the C^0 normal plane distribution along Λ , one can nevertheless construct a *tubular neighborhood* of Λ ([H, 4.5]). In particular, we can find neighborhoods U_0 and U_1 of the submanifolds Λ_0 and Λ_1 respectively, such that $U_0 \cap U_1 = \emptyset$, and

- (a) Λ_1 is a deformation retract of U_1 , while $W \setminus U_0$ is a deformation retract of $W \setminus \Lambda_0$.

Because $C^\infty(W)$ is dense in $C^1(W)$ ([H, 2.2]), we may now select an $\epsilon > 0$ and a function $\tilde{f} \in C^\infty(W)$ which approximates f well enough to ensure the following:

(b) $W \setminus U_0 \subset \tilde{f}^{-1}([\epsilon, 1 + \epsilon])$, $\tilde{f}^{-1}([1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]) \subset U_1$, and

(c) The set $\tilde{f}^{-1}([\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon])$ contains no critical point of $\tilde{f}$.

By (c) and standard Morse theory ([Mi, Theorem 3.1]), we deduce that

(d) $\tilde{f}^{-1}([1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon])$ is a deformation retract of $\tilde{f}^{-1}([\epsilon, 1 + \epsilon])$.

We then obtain the desired deformation retraction $W \setminus \Lambda_0 \rightarrow \Lambda_1$ with ease: First deform $W \setminus \Lambda_0$ onto $W \setminus U_0$ by (a); then continue to deform it onto $\tilde{f}^{-1}([1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon])$ by (b) and (d); finally deform onto Λ_1 by (a) and (b). $\square$

We are now ready to prove our main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Consider first the more elementary case of conical $\mathcal{Q}$ where a quick calculation yields

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{E}_F(p, q) = -2F(p) \cdot QF(q) \quad (\mathcal{Q} \text{ conical}).$$

To get a contradiction, suppose F has no pair of parallel tangent planes. Then at any critical point (p, q) of $\mathcal{E}_F$, Observation 1.2 gives $F(p) = \lambda F(q)$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$. Hence $F(p) \cdot QF(q) = \lambda F(q) \cdot QF(q) = 0$. But then $\mathcal{E}_F(p, q) = 0$ by (2) above. This makes 0 the *only* critical value of $\mathcal{E}_F$, so that $\mathcal{E}_F$ must vanish identically on $M \times M$. But then $d\mathcal{E}_F$ vanishes identically too, and Observation 1.2 now says that $F(p) = \lambda F(q)$ for *all* $p, q \in M$. In particular, this confines $F(M)$ to the line spanned by $F(q)$ for any $q \in M$, which is clearly impossible. Our Theorem therefore holds in the conical case.

To get the result for smooth $\mathcal{Q}$, note first that we can assume connectivity of M . We will again seek a contradiction by supposing F has no parallel tangent planes. By Lemma 2.1 A_F is an embedded submanifold of codimension $n + 1 \geq 2$ in the connected manifold $M \times M$, so that $(M \times M) \setminus A_F$ remains connected.

Now consider the function $f := \frac{1}{4c}(1 - \mathcal{E}_F)$, which has the same critical points as $\mathcal{E}_F$. By Observation 1.2, the absence of parallel tangent planes forces all critical points of f to lie on $A_F = f^{-1}(0)$, and $\Delta \cup D_F = f^{-1}(1)$. In particular, f is extremized on precisely these sets, and Lemma 2.2 now applies, making $\Delta \cup D_F$ a deformation retract of $(M \times M) \setminus A_F$. The connectivity of the latter now implies that of the former, and by Observation 1.3 this forces $D_F = \emptyset$.

On the other hand, applying Lemma 2.2 again, this time with $f := \frac{1}{4c}\mathcal{E}_F$, we may deduce that A_F is a deformation retract of $(M \times M) \setminus \Delta$, and the isomorphisms of cohomology groups (using $\mathbf{Z}_2$ coefficients henceforth)

$$H^n((M \times M) \setminus \Delta) \approx H^n(A_F) \approx 0,$$

because $\dim A_F = n - 1$. Consider, however, the long exact homology sequence for the pair $(M \times M, \Delta)$, which includes the segment

$$\cdots \rightarrow H_n(\Delta) \rightarrow H_n(M \times M) \rightarrow H_n(M \times M, \Delta) \rightarrow \cdots .$$

By Lefschetz duality (cf. for example, [Mu, Theorem 72.3]), the last group above is isomorphic to $H^n((M \times M) \setminus \Delta)$, which vanishes, as we just saw. The homomorphism $H_n(\Delta) \rightarrow H_n(M \times M)$ must then be surjective. But this is impossible: $\Delta \approx M$ so $H_n(\Delta) = \mathbf{Z}_2$, while $H_n(M \times M)$ has rank at least two. This settles the case where $\mathcal{Q}$ is smooth, and we have proven our Theorem. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [G] M. Ghomi, *Non-existence of skew loops on ellipsoids* To appear in PAMS. Preprint available at <http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/math.CO/0311292> .
- [GS] M. Ghomi & B. Solomon, *Skew loops and quadric surfaces*, Comment. Math. Helv., 77 (2002) 767-782.
- [H] M. Hirsch, **Differential Topology**, Springer-Verlag Graduate Texts in Mathematics **33**, New York 1976.
- [Mi] J. Milnor, **Morse Theory**, Princeton University Press 1963.
- [Mu] J. Munkres, **Elements of Algebraic Topology**, Addison-Wesley 1984.
- [Se] B. Segre, *Sulle coppie di tangenti fra loro parallele relative ad una curva chiusa sghemba*, **Hommage au Prof. Lucien Godeaux**, 141-167, Librairie Universitaire, Louvain, 1968.
- [T] S. Tabachnikov, *On skew loops, skew branes and quadratic hypersurfaces*, Moscow Math. J., 3 (2003), 681-690.
- [W] J.H. White, *Global Properties of Immersions into Euclidean Spheres*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **20** (12) 1971, 1187-1194

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405

E-mail address: jsha@indiana.edu, solomon@indiana.edu